



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,891	12/06/2000	Steven Teig	SPLX.P0002	1036
23349	7590	03/03/2004	EXAMINER	
STATTLER JOHANSEN & ADELI			DO, THUAN V	
P O BOX 51860			ART UNIT	
PALO ALTO, CA 94303			PAPER NUMBER	
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/731,891	Applicant(s) TEIG ET AL.	
	Examiner Thuan Do	Art Unit 2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/10/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-13, 43-64 and 88-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 14-42 and 65-87 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-10, 12, 13, 43-45, 48, 49, 51-64 and 88-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 46, 47 and 50 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10&11/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to amendment entered on 12/11/2003. Claims 4-13,43-64,88-96 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-3,14-42,65-87 have been canceled.

Information Disclosure Statement.

The foreign patent documents (cite no. 45-51.) and non patent literature documents (cite no. 52-88) received on December 10 and 11, 2003 need to be supplied in next response for completed consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in-
(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 4-10,12,13,43-45,48,49,51-64,88-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi et al., Pat. No. 6301686.

Regarding claim 4: Kikuchi teaches a method comprising:

using a diagonal line to measure a placement metric (col. 1, lines 23-38);

wherein using the diagonal line to measure a placement metric comprises calculating an estimate of the length of interconnect lines necessary to connect the circuit elements of said net, wherein the calculation measures the length of at least one line that is at least partially diagonal (col. 10, lines 55-67 where diagonal directions of

length is calculated by an angle of component terminal placement for the function of partially diagonal).

Regarding claims 5-10,12,13: These claims teach a well know features similar method of claim 4 and rejected as similar manner.

Regarding claim 43: This claim teaches a similar method of claim 4 and rejected as same manner.

Regarding claims 44,45,48,49,51-57: These claims teach a well know features similar method of claim 43 and rejected as similar manner.

Regarding claim 58: Kikuchi teaches a method comprising:

a) for each particular net, defining a minimum spanning tree (col. 10, lines 55-67 using dividing any directions in the longitudinal for matching minimum spanning tree) that models the topology of interconnect lines for connecting the circuit elements of the particular net, said minimum spanning trees having edges, wherein at least one of the edges of at least one of the minimum spanning trees is at least partially diagonals (col. 16, lines 4-11 where minimum routing terminals for matching the function of minimum spanning trees and col. 10, lines 55-67 for matching partially diagonal as rejected in claim 1);

b) calculating the length of the edges of the minimum spanning trees (col. 10, lines 55-67 as the same function of calculated by an angle of component terminal placement); and

c) combining the length calculations to obtain an estimate of the total interconnect-line length needed for connecting the circuit elements of the nets (col. 16, lines 22-28 where routing combination to match combining the length calculations claim and col. 11, line 1-18 where comparison of lengths are used in place of estimate of the total interconnect-line length to claim).

Regarding claims 59,60: These claims teach a well know features similar method of claim 58 and rejected as similar manner.

Regarding claim 61: This claim teaches a similar method of claim 58 and rejected as same manner.

Regarding claims 62-64: These claims teach a well know features similar method of claim 61 and rejected as similar manner.

Regarding claim 88: This claim teaches a similar method of claim 4 since wherein at least two some of the edges are neither parallel nor orthogonal to each other is another language of partial diagonal connection and rejected as same manner.

Regarding claims 89-96: These claims teach a well know features similar method of claim 88 and rejected as similar manner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but a new search found a prior art of Kikuchi and a new ground of rejection is done in the above section.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 11,46,47,50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONTACT INFORMATION

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan Do whose telephone number is 571-272-1891. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30 (except 2nd Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2825

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0596.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thuan Do', with a stylized, cursive script.

Thuan Do
Patent examiner
2/18/04